IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAMKUMAR

FRIDAY, THE 28TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 6TH ASWINA 1929

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 3513 of 2007()

CRA.683/2005 of II ADDL.SESSIONS COURT, KOLLAM
CC.963/2002 of CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE COURT, KOLLAM

.....

REVN. PETITIONER/APPELLANT/ACCUSED:

P.PRADEEP KUMAR
(WRONGLY SHOWN AS P.P.PRADEEP KUMAR
IN THE APPELLATE JUDGMENT), UNIVERSAL
INDUSTRIES, STEEL AND ALUMINIUM FABRICATORS,
REG. NO.X-10851/PM/10/15/2003M, ALTHARAMOODU P.O.,
ALAMODE (VIA), TRIVANDRUM.

BY ADV. SRI.M.R.RAJESH

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. M/S.OMEGA METALS, S/697, CHEKKOTHU JUNCTION, ASRAMAM WEST, KOLLAM, REP. BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER, MOHAMMED MOSADIC.

2. STATE OF KERALA, REP. BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF KERALA.

R2 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 28/09/2007, THE COURT ON 28/09/2007 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

V.RAMKUMAR, J.

.....

Crl. R.P. No.3513 of 2007

.....

Dated this the 28th day of September, 2007.

ORDER

In this Revision filed under Section 397 read with Sec.401 Cr.P.C. the petitioner who was the accused in C.C. No.963 of 2002 on the file of the Judicial First Class Magistrate, Kollam challenges the conviction entered and the sentence passed against him for an offence punishable under Sec. 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (herinafter referred to as "the Act").

2. I heard the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and the learned Public Prosecutor.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the Revision Petitioner re-iterated the contentions in support of the Revision. The courts below have concurrently held that the cheque in question was drawn by the petitioner in favour of the complainant on the drawee bank, that the cheque was validly presented to the bank, that it was dishonoured for reasons which fall under Section 138 of the Act, that the complainant made a demand for payment by a notice in time in accordance with clause (b) of the proviso to Section 138 of the Act and that the Revision Petitioner/accused failed to make the payment within 15 days of receipt of the statutory notice. Both the courts

have considered and rejected the defence set up by the revision petitioner while entering the above finding. The said finding has been recorded on an appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence. I do not find any error, illegality or impropriety in the finding so recorded concurrently by the courts below. The conviction was thus rightly entered against the petitioner.

4. What now survives for consideration is the question as to whether a proper sentence has been imposed on the Revision Petitioner. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am, however, inclined to modify the sentence imposed on the revision petitioner. Accordingly, if the revision petitioner pays to the second respondent complainant by way of compensation under Sec. 357(3) Cr.P.C. a sum of Rs.53,000/- (Rupees fifty three thousand only) within four months from today, then he need to undergo only imprisonment till the rising of the court. If the revision petitioner commits default in making the payment as aforesaid, he shall undergo simple imprisonment for three months by way of default sentence.

5. Money, if any, deposited by the revision petitioner before the trial court shall be refunded to him.

This Revision is disposed of confirming the conviction but modifying the sentence as above.

V.RAMKUMAR
Judge

pms